



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In addition to the defects almost inseparable from such a book as this—here the elaboration of principle at the expense of fact, there of fact at the expense of principle—there appear to be some faults, though but few, of the separable variety. Of the latter class is the contention that the governor and chief State officials should be regarded as a unit and not as a plural executive. Of the former, a good illustration is found on p. 374 where the author, after having stated that the Marxian theory of surplus value is open to attack in that it attributes to labor the whole of the productive result, and does not allot a share to the machine, remarks that it is impossible to enter into the economic discussion to which this question gives occasion. Limitation in the discussion, of course, is necessary, but it is evident that it is sometimes at a price.

HAROLD M. BOWMAN.

National Administration of the United States. By JOHN A. FAIRLIE, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1905. Pp. 274.)

Local Government in the Counties, Towns and Villages. By JOHN A. FAIRLIE, Ph.D. (New York: The Century Company. The American State Series. 1906. Pp. 279.)

The first of these two works is in a sense a ground breaker. It is the first attempt to describe in a systematic, detailed way the administrative mechanism of our national government. It is an account of the organization of the central administration with its nine great executive departments and their numerous subdivisions as they now stand, after more than a century of adaptation and growth. Only so much of history is introduced as is necessary to the understanding of the present system.

The tardy appearance of the first book in this field shows how badly the study of government has been neglected in America—especially government on its administrative side. In fact, the scientific study of administration did not begin until 1893, when Goodnow's *Comparative Administrative Law* appeared, dealing partly with American conditions. It was not until 1903 that the first book bearing the title of *American Administrative Law* made its appearance.

In no other single country has the work of the constructive statesman been more bold, original and fruitful in the last one hundred and

thirty years than in America, as seen in the creation of our Federal constitutional system, the increased participation and initiative of the citizen in government, and in the organization and scope of party activity. Yet it is a deplorable fact that the inspiration toward the systematic study of our political system has come largely from Europeans. Such French, German and English publicists as De Tocqueville, Lieber and Bryce led the way. Even our leading writers today owe their start largely to their studies under German and French masters.

In the last ten or fifteen years there has been a gratifying increase of interest in political science among American students. The steady growth of the literature of the science alone shows the upward tendency very clearly. Dr. Fairlie's book is a valuable addition to this literature. It is filled with information, carefully collected, sifted and organized. The volume will be useful to the official, the student, and the citizen who wants reliable information in compact form. The bibliography and citation of cases is a good feature of the work.

The second book, entitled *Local Government in Counties, Towns and Villages*, covers more familiar ground. Embracing so vast and varied a series of institutions as rural local government in forty-five States, the treatise must of necessity be very general. The distinctive local flavor of rural government in each State is largely lost in such a work. It must be, to give unity and coherence to the whole. However, the author has done his work well within the limitations fixed.

One subject is apparently not treated in the full light of recent monographic studies. That is the nature of the southern rural local government and its development. The author makes a distinct advance over Howard's *Local Constitutional History* and the textbook men, but he does not quite bring his work abreast of all the recent monographic literature.

In tracing the evolution of rural local government in the South it should be made clear that the "parish" appeared only in the tide-water region. That is true in all the older Southern States, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Louisiana. This region was the theater of early colonial activity where the Episcopal church, excepting in Louisiana, was the established church. The parish never appeared in the hinterland where the Scotch, Irish, German and

the overflow population from the coast settlements held the frontier. These settlers would have none of the English established church. The revolution swept away the established church and no parishes were laid out after that date. So, in the back country the local districts were called counties. In some cases the coast parishes were erected into counties, keeping the old name.

In South Carolina the English county was introduced in 1682 but it never took root. It remained a mere name for a geographical district and was used to mark the jurisdiction of the justice's court. In 1785, through the influence of a Virginian who had migrated into the State, the Virginia county was introduced by State law, but the plan proved a failure and in 1799 the county was abolished from South Carolina, not to return until after the Civil War.

The local divisions into which the State was divided were circuit court districts and were always called "districts" by the people.

The functions of local government were carried out through commissioners and close-boards provided by the State legislature. These commissioners laid and collected taxes, built and repaired highways, bridges and fences, put up the jails and court-houses, etc. The people of the districts did not even elect the sheriff or clerk until after 1810. The legislature elected the governor, lieutenant-governor, and all other State and local officers.

The only exception to this complete centralization we find in the tide-water region where the old parishes still existed. The parish authorities took care of the poor and acted as election officers. The roads were in charge of the commissions, however.

The local government of South Carolina was so distinctly different from that of Virginia that it constituted a type of its own, as different from that of Virginia as the Virginia county system was from the New England and Middle States plans. It seems worth while to call attention in this review to this oversight. The present system of local government in South Carolina dates from reconstruction days.

Dr. Fairlie's book is an advance upon the earlier works on local government and is a valuable addition to the very able *American State Series*, edited by Professor Willoughby.

W. A. SCHAPER.